

1971

# A case study of Steve P.

Kathleen Kunimoto

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/pacs\\_capstones](http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/pacs_capstones)



Part of the [Medicine and Health Sciences Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Kunimoto, Kathleen, "A case study of Steve P." (1971). *Independent Studies and Capstones*. Paper 98. Program in Audiology and Communication Sciences, Washington University School of Medicine.  
[http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/pacs\\_capstones/98](http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/pacs_capstones/98)

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Program in Audiology and Communication Sciences at Digital Commons@Becker. It has been accepted for inclusion in Independent Studies and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Becker. For more information, please contact [engeszer@wustl.edu](mailto:engeszer@wustl.edu).

INDEPENDENT STUDY

A CASE STUDY OF STEVE P.

Kathleen Kunimoto  
ADVISOR - Dr. Kleffner  
May 23, 1971

## INTRODUCTION

Children with so-called learning disabilities are better described than labeled, using terms which are <sup>not</sup> ambiguous. Barbara Bateman gives a good, general description of these children.

..... the child with learning disabilities is perhaps best described as one who manifests an educationally significant discrepancy between his apparent capacity for language behavior and his actual level of language functioning." (p. 167)

Bateman breaks down the area of learning disabilities into three major subcategories. (pp. 167-168)

- 1) Dyslexia, or reading disability, is the most frequent of all types of learning disabilities or language disorders. "Those who distinguish 'primary' dyslexia as a specific congenital syndrome find fewer cases than do those whose definition is based on a simple discrepancy between apparent capacity for reading and actual level of reading, regardless of etiological or correlated factors." (p. 167)
- 2) Verbal communication disorders, or difficulties with the comprehension or expression of spoken language.
- 3) Visual-motor integration problems have been widely noted, often in connection with reading problems.

The distinction between linguistic competence and linguistic performance is also a basis for defining language disability and methods for

teaching language (Kleffner, 1967). Linguistic competence refers to a person's total knowledge about language which is necessary for him to perform. Linguistic performance is viewed as one's actual use of language in comprehending and in using sentences. Limitations imposed on performance are many and not all of these are entirely within the performer. Therefore, evaluation of competence should not be undertaken until performance has been thoroughly examined. "We must be prepared to account for a child's lack of performance by showing how it derives from his competence." ".....impairment of the capacity to receive language always interferes with the development of linguistic competence." <sup>2</sup> (p. 1451, 1453)

In this paper a particular child, Steve, will be described in terms of his difficulties based on observations, objective tests, actual work done with him and classroom teacher's evaluations. The state of his present language behavior and conclusions and recommendations will also be included.

Using Bateman's division of learning disabilities, Steve might be said to have a form of dyslexia, that is, reading difficulty. There is a discrepancy between his capacity for reading and his actual level of reading. Since he seems to comprehend and use spoken language better than written language, verbal communication disorder does not seem to be the most significant if his hearing impairment is taken into account. Not much can be said regarding visual-motor integration problems unless implied here is the association between written and spoken language. If this is the case, Steve does have difficulty which might be classified under this subcategory.

Steve is one of those children whose development of linguistic competence has been disrupted by the inability to normally receive language through hearing due to hearing impairment which averages 85 dB in both ears for the speech frequencies (500, 1000 and 2000 Hz). Etiology of his impair-

3

ment may be traced to maternal rubella during the first trimester of pregnancy. A Zenith Vocalizer II with a Y-cord is presently being used by Steve. Prior to this type of pseudo-binaural amplification, only his left ear was aided. Tolerance for louder volume settings had to be built up in his right ear before binaural amplification could be provided.

From May 1962 to June 1966, Steve attended the Houston School for the Deaf where he was taught by the association method. Early in his education at age 3 and 1/2 years, he was identified as having a memory problem. Psychometric tests indicated normal intelligence.

Upon evaluation at Central Institute in 1966, placement in the speech pathology department was recommended and the association method be used. He remained in this department through May 1969. Since September 1969, he has been integrated into primary classes for the deaf.

Steve has been described by most of his teachers as having a low frustration level. He was and is a co-operative student. He tries hard in the classroom but tends to have a defeatist attitude when faced with new material especially written language. These comments regarding frustration level and attitude are made because of the significant influence they have on Steve's performance. As has already been said, before making a judgment regarding linguistic competence based on performance, the observer should first analyze conditions influencing performance. In Steve's case, the fear of failure is one of these conditions. At the beginning of this year, Steve would not try to attack reading material. Last school year, he would literally cry when written material was brought out. He may or may not have had the skills to handle written language but the interference of his avoidance behavior made it difficult to examine his performance and, thus, his linguistic competence.

A consistent reoccurring report from various teachers is that Steve does

4

better in spoken language than in written language. This is in terms of actual comprehension through lipreading and audition and language use - phonemic and syntactic. In other words, there is a discrepancy between his oral abilities and his handling of written language. As a general rule, hearing impaired children in this school should be able to read and write what they can say. This was not true for Steve. It was observed by his classroom teacher and by the supervisor of the primary department as well as by this writer that he did not seem to be able at times to associate the written form of language and meanings. He exhibited difficulty in sounding out familiar words he had not seen written out such as the word sick. For this word he would keep saying stick. He could use this word, sick, appropriately in spontaneous oral language. If the word were said to him, he would have understood it immediately. His classroom teacher reported in May 1970 that "he can stand by the charts and articulate all the phonemes, but is very unsure of himself when a new word occurs. He tends to look at the initial phoneme and then say an already familiar word that starts that way. When he says all the sounds of a new word it still has no meaning for him, but if the teacher says it, he immediately associates it correctly." More observational data regarding Steve's language behavior will be contained in the section of this paper having to do with the practical work done with Steve.

In order to confirm, reveal or eliminate some ideas regarding Steve's "problems", objective tests were administered and scores on achievement tests were collected from his file. Discussion of these tests - why they were given, what they purport to indicate and the results - will be included in this paper.

The purpose of this report is to attempt to give an objective description of Steve since some disagreement has arisen regarding the nature of his par-

5  
ticular difficulties. In addition, lessons prepared for and used with Steve  
are included to show what was done and how he responded.

## DISCUSSION OF TESTS AND RESULTS

One of the hypotheses regarding Steve's problems in reading was that they might stem from faulty articulation. The Goldman-Fristoe Test of Articulation and the Oral Form Perception Test were administered.

The Goldman-Fristoe Test contains three subtests. The results of these provide comparisons of the individual's performance in different speaking situations with himself as the reference for articulation errors he may make. This is as opposed to comparisons of the articulation of other individuals of the same age, socio-economic status, etc. In the Sounds-in-Words and Sounds-in-Sentences subtests, the objective is to provide a means of sampling a person's articulatory performance under different speaking conditions and for comparing it to the standard of correct production. By looking at the two matrices of these subtests, one can determine which sounds are said in error and under what conditions. In addition, to this, consistency of overall articulation can also be noted - categories of errors, voiced for unvoiced, substitutions, distortions, etc.

Sounds-in-Words subtest tested the consonant sounds in the initial, medial and final positions. Stimulus pictures were used here. Steve made no outstanding errors except for those rather characteristic of hearing impaired children. These were t or th for s, omission of s and th for th.

Similar errors were noted in the Sounds-in-Sentences subtest. The Stimulability subtest is given to see whether or not the subject can produce only the misarticulated sound correctly under optimal conditions in the context being used - in isolation from imitation, in syllables, in words and in sentences. Only those sounds previously given in error are checked in this section. Steve was able to produce correctly those sounds he gave incorrectly in the other subtests except for the s and the blends, skw, sl and st.



7

The Oral Form Perception Test was given by a speech therapist. Norms for this test are based on hearing children whose average age was 14.3 years. The mean number of errors for those with articulation disorders was 11.9. Steve's mean number of errors was 14.9 putting him in the category of severe articulation problem. This test briefly involved the discrimination of various small plastic forms placed in the subject's mouth so that he could feel it with his tongue and tell whether it was the same or different. The results may imply the existence of faulty or poor kinesthetic feedback. Steve's observed articulation does not coincide with the severe articulation problem indicated by this test. Articulation here being defined as the production of a particular sound in isolation and in the environment of other sounds. Steve is far from being unintelligible if this is what the test purports. He has good articulation ability and can produce almost all the sounds correctly when he tries as seen in the results of the Goldman-Fristoe. Results of this test are clouded by the existence of Steve's hearing impairment and his heavy reliance on his hearing to take in models for speech and language. Knowing this, one must take into account that he is receiving an amplified, distorted speech signal due to the nature of his hearing impairment. Therefore, his idea of how a sound should be produced may be patterned after the models he hears. This may compound the problem of inadequate kinesthetic feedback if this problem does exist.

The Wepman Test of Auditory Discrimination was given. The examiner says pairs of words and the child is to say whether they sound the same or different. No visual cues are given. The word pairs selected were matched for familiarity by choosing words as close together as possible. Every possible match of phonemes used in English was made within phonetic categories - e.g. phonemes within the articulatory category of simple stops (p, t, k) were matched only with other phonemes within that category. Cross matching between

8

phonetic categories was not done in order to avoid possible discrimination being based on differences in articulation positions rather than on the auditory basis being tested. Length of words was also equated in each pair. Standardization was on a hearing population. The Wepman has been useful in determining those children who are slower than their peers in developing auditory discrimination. This is highly related to the development of speech accuracy and somewhat related to reading ability. Another use of this test is in accounting for children who appear delayed in developing speech accuracy on an auditory basis. "For older children the test has been found useful in the differential diagnosis of reading and speech difficulties. When poor discrimination has been found, it has proven useful to develop special techniques for increasing auditory perception or for increasing the visual modality of learning while the auditory modality is developing." <sup>Wepman Auditory Discrim. Test -</sup> (Manual of Directions)

Word pairs were read at a level where Steve indicated he could hear. Word pairs differed in only one phoneme. As might be expected, Steve did rather poorly on this test. He was within acceptable limits for the X score but the test had to be counted as invalid because the Y-score exceeded the acceptable number of errors. A hearing defect is naturally suggested as a reason for such poor scores. Such children should be easily recognized by their very bad articulation and/or their very poor phonic ability in reading. It might be noted that out of a possible 40, Steve was correct on 24. Fine discrimination ability was required for this task. Even though this tester anticipated an invalid test, it was interesting to note Steve's performance because he relies heavily on his residual hearing.

The Token Test was administered by a speech clinician. This test involves comprehension of language to carry out increasingly complex directions. Chips of different color, shape and size were used. First, the examiner read the

9

the directions to the subject. On the second presentation, the subject was allowed to read the directions himself, silently, and refer back to the paper if he needed to do so in order to carry out the task. Steve did better when he read the instructions silently (Number correct = 129 out of 163 possible) as compared to a score of 104 on the oral presentation. It is interesting to note that Steve's classroom teacher predicted he would do better on the oral presentation. The oral presentation requires not only language comprehension but also auditory memory for the language and for sequence. Common errors made in both forms of presentation seemed to involve difficulty with language comprehension particularly the conditional "if \_\_\_\_, (then) \_\_\_\_", "\_\_\_\_ except \_\_\_\_", adverbs - quickly and slowly - "instead of" and "together with". Steve has not yet been taught these constructions in class as yet so it is not surprising that he missed these.

Achievement tests given in school are also indicators of comprehension of written language. In May 1970, Steve was given the Gates - MacGinitie Reading Test. He made a raw score of 14 correct which was equivalent to a 1.9 grade level. This test, however, is not standardized for hearing impaired. This year, the Stanford Achievement Test was given. The form used was adapted for hearing impaired children and was standardized for them. Steve was given this test in March 1971. This is the first time this particular form of the test has been given at Central Institute. By looking at the scores on tests dealing with reading comprehension, one can see that Steve scores fairly high in the areas tested as compared to the others in his class. (See class score sheet). In Sentence and Word Meaning, Paragraph Meaning and Language Steve scored in the upper half of his class. The average grade level for these particular subtests for Steve was 2.6.

It appears from the achievement tests that Steve's present ability to

10

comprehend written language has greatly improved over last year's performance on the Gates-MacGinitie. The correlation of results between the Stanford and the Gates are not known by this writer but teacher comments and observations, in addition to these tests, indicate better reading skills in terms of comprehension over the 1969-70 school year.

At this point in time, Steve is not exhibiting as many difficulties in reading as he did last year, for instance. Keeping this in mind, the results of these tests can only be used in bringing out possible explanations for the problems he did seem to have. In other words, these tests were given "after the fact", after Steve had been provided with special tutoring and intensive teaching. One cannot really say whether or not Steve's problems were "special". It has been suggested that teaching has been a factor in zeroing in on things he does which seem unusual and thus draws attention to them. However, this observer cannot say that this zeroing-in has hurt Steve, especially considering his achievement scores in reading or in handling language, in general. An issue can be made from a clinician's point of view and from an educator's side of the case but this will not be dealt with at this time.

A final hypothesis which could not be objectively test has to do with the self-monitoring concept. When Steve reads outloud, he has difficulty in sounding out words. He may be relying more on his own auditory channel to clue him in on how a particular word sounds and thus derive meaning from auditory recognition rather than through sight recognition. He is, however, receiving a distorted speech signal due to his hearing impairment and, in addition, he may be giving himself misarticulated speech to audit. Therefore, if he reads a familiar word wrong (a word he understands in spoken language and which he uses spontaneously), he cannot recognize it auditorily and as a

11

result does not associate it with any meaning. This assumption may account for the observation that Steve more readily understands language spoken by someone else. Because the speaker is providing him with an auditory pattern with which he is familiar rather than his own, perhaps, misarticulated or distorted speech, he recognizes the word and associates the meaning more quickly.

## PRACTICAL WORK

The writer worked with Steve and two of his classmates for a half hour everyday from January 28th through April 2nd of this year. The other children had difficulties similar to Steve's, that is, associating the spoken and written form of vowels in particular. An overall approach was developed during the teaching period and various lessons were made up each week based on this approach. "Lesson Background" is a summary of previous weeks' observations regarding the children and prior work leading up to the lesson prepared. The "Lesson" section is a brief summary of what has been planned for the week. "Materials" and "Procedure" are self-explanatory.

Evaluations of each week of teaching are also included since the children's progress is noted in these as well as other observations of their language. Steve's classroom teacher's comments regarding the overall effect of the tutoring is included also after the final evaluation.

## LESSON A

### LESSON BACKGROUND:

Particular difficulty in associating the spoken and written forms of vowel sounds have been noted by Steve's classroom teacher, the supervising teacher of the primary department and his previous speech teacher.

Previously, work was done on associating vowel sounds and their symbols. Stress was placed on Steve's learning to monitor his own production of vowel sounds as he read the written symbols, each sound in isolation as well as in words, phrases and sentences.

The main stimulus should be the written form of the vowel sounds in isolation, in words and in sentences. Work needs to be done on the recognition of primary and secondary spellings. It was noted by this observer that frequently rather than going by sounds, Steve would seek out spellings on the Northampton charts.

E.g. If given the words bowl and clown, he would point to either the secondary spelling of o-e or ou which is ow in both cases, for the vowel in either word.

Though much work has been done on this association between the written form and the self-monitoring of the spoken form, continued reinforcement and practice is indicated.

### LESSON:

A review of vowels already covered in previous speech sessions will be done. Emphasis will be on recognition of secondary spellings as well as the primary since confusion arises when directions are given to point out the vowel sounds in a particular word. Whenever a word is written by the teacher or by the child, the child will be asked to say the vowel(s) in that word, underline it in different colored chalk, find the symbol on the vowel chart and then repeat the sound.

The main objective is to give practice in monitoring the production of a sound and then associating it with the written symbol for that sound. The teacher will offer minimal auditory cues when specific work on this is being done.

### MATERIALS:

1. Flash cards - vowel symbols and word cards
2. Sentence strips
3. Speech mirror

## PROCEDURE:

1. Review "ou" and its secondary spelling "ow"<sup>1</sup> -

- a. Recall a few words elicited by the children during the last session and make up sentences containing some of these. The teacher and children will make up the sentences together.

Prepared word list -

clown	mouse	town
brown	outside	down
ouch	cow	flower
power	towh	mouse

- b. Teacher prepared sentences if needed. (See "Lesson" for identification procedure for vowels.)

Jane spotted a mouse in the house.  
 The clown ran around the circus ring.  
 Mark wiped his face with a dry towel.  
 When the snow melts we can plant flowers.  
 Kim bought a glass bowl for her mother downtown.

2. Review primary and secondary spellings for o-e and check for recall of the difference between ow and ow when these spellings occur. (See "Lesson" for vowel identification procedure.)

- a. Teacher will give clues or riddles, the answers to which will be words containing o-e sound with its various secondary spellings. The following sentences will be written out for the child so practice will be given in reading.

I can float on the water. ( a boat)  
 Cars drive over me. (a road)  
 You can use me to make your hair look nice. (a comb)  
 I am sometimes big and sometimes small. I am hard.  
 You can find me on the ground. ( a stone )  
 I am thinking of a game where you use a heavy ball to  
 knock down pins. (bowling)

- b. Child can also be asked to think of other words containing this sound and make up sentences.

- c. To check for recall and to reinforce, the teacher could list words on the board, have the children read them and indicate which vowel, ou or o-e, is present. They will read the words outloud and point to the symbol on the chart.

Prepared word list -

towel	coat	coke
mole	count	loud
low	down	roll
pole	found	smoke

## 3. Review and compare ah and aw. (See "Lesson" for procedure for vowel identification.)



- a. Teacher will use flash cards containing the primary and secondary spellings for each of these vowel sounds and have the children say the sounds. When the teacher presents a word, the child will read it and point to the vowel symbol on the chart.
- b. The teacher may also say "I will think of a letter and you tell me some words that start with this letter and have these vowel sounds." The child will be told he can use ou and o-e also. Once the word is said, he must pick out the vowel and point to it on the chart and/or write it on the board.

E.g. Teacher - "I am thinking of the letter p. Who can give me some words that begin with this letter? You can use ou, ah, aw or o-e." Teacher will give examples. ( This may be difficult due to lack of vocabulary and the directions may not be clear.)

Possible words that might be given -

paw  
power  
proud

## LESSON B

### LESSON BACKGROUND:

The children are now familiar with the general procedure of identification of a vowel and the routine of associating their spoken sounds with the written form. It seems that they are more able to, in general, monitor their own sound production. Progress seems to have been made using the present procedure of closely contrasting sounds the children confuse rather than deliberately presenting them at different times. At this point, the children need to be confronted by this task of distinguishing between the elements which have been confusing them.

The teacher must be aware of reversals in writing and correct these immediately and consistently.

### LESSON:

On the first day there will be a review of sounds already covered, ou, o-e, -i- and i-e, to check for recall. Words containing these sounds will be presented in sentences and the children will be asked to find the vowels worked on and identify them following the same procedure already established.

More individual work will be done based on problems found to be specific to a particular child. These difficulties are ones noted by the classroom teacher, the supervising teacher and the speech teacher.

The overall approach is to deliberately contrast sounds which are being confused or, in other terms, sounds not being monitored correctly, auditorily and/or kinesthetically. This will continue to place emphasis on associating the child's sound production and written forms of these sounds.

### MATERIALS:

1. Sentence strips
2. Word cards
3. Vowel and consonant charts

### PROCEDURE:

1. Review vowels already worked on, ou, o-e, -i- and i-e, and their secondary spellings. This will be done by presenting sentence strips which include words containing these sounds. The children will be asked to find these words and identify the vowels and point to the corresponding symbols on the vowel chart.
2. Contrasting -a- and a-e will be done since this confusion arose during the last teaching period. There is some confusion between the name for a letter and the sound the letter represents in a written word.

- a. Teacher will ask each child to say these sounds in isolation.
- b. The sounds will be presented in words first written by the teacher or by one of the children. This is a slight modification of the past routine in order to reduce auditory cues. Not only will the children get practice in writing but as one writes, the others will be provided with more practice in reading themselves. The teacher will have each child whisper the word to her after it is written so the others can't hear. This will be done so the teacher can check whether the word can be read correctly by the child as well as written. When all have done this and come to an agreement, one child will underline the vowel using different colored chalk, say the vowel only, point to the vowel on the chart and then repeat the vowel sound.
- c. A variation of the activity just mentioned in "b" above would be to have the children and teacher make a composite list of words without first saying them outloud. After this is done, the children will read the words and then re-write them so that there are two columns of words, one for words containing the -a- sound and one for a-e. If words appearing in the composite list do not fit into either of the columns, the children will have to recognize this. Occasionally the teacher will ask if they can identify the vowels in these "inappropriate" words and find them on the chart. This exercise will give practice in writing, reading and self-monitoring as well as giving the teacher an opportunity to see where other difficulties may exist which will need work.

E.g. Composite word list (sample) -

paint
pat
ball
face
can
day
black

Re-written words, under vowel symbols -

<u>-a-</u>	<u>a-e</u>
pat	paint
can	face
black	day

"ball" is an inappropriate word. Since this is the case, the teacher will ask if anyone can show her which vowel it contains. It might be helpful to indicate that this is "how we say it" and "this is how we spell it".

- d. The words listed will be presented in sentences. Identification of vowels will be done and also phrasing. These sentences may be generated by the children or by the teacher.

Prepared sentences -

- The man painted the wall gray.
- Mike made a sour face after he ate the green apple.
- Apples are picked in the fall.
- Pat can skate backwards.

4. In order not to ignore auditory training, the teacher will use the sentence strips or write sentences on the board which include words containing the sounds being worked on. The teacher will -
- a. have the child read the sentence first then turn his back to the teacher and to the board,
  - b. then read a phrase or a word from the sentences and then have the child turn around and find it on the board.
  - c. The same "key" vowel word(s) will be used in a different context and the same two steps mentioned above, a and b, will be repeated. This is another way of associating the spoken and written forms.

E.g. Using the same word in different sentence contexts -

The man painted the wall gray.  
Get the gray book on my desk.

5. Individual work - Steve was noted to have difficulty distinguishing the sounds t and k. He was able to distinguish the two auditorily when they were said to him, but he could not tell the difference when he said them himself, i.e., Steve recognized the difference between take and cake when the two words were spoken to him, but he did not correct himself when he repeated his sentence, "I will cake the papers," even after he had heard the two words, take and cake, contrasted.

To further check on this apparent nondifferentiation and to make Steve aware of similar sounding, monosyllabic words differing only in the presence of t or k will be given to Steve.

- a. Check for correct production and recognition of isolated written forms of t and k - Teacher will point to these on the consonant chart and ask him to say them.
- b. Check for auditory discrimination - Teacher will say a list of words as described above and ask Steve to write what he hears.
- c. Self-monitoring task - Teacher will write similar list of words on the board and have him read these outloud. He will be asked to underline the consonant t or k whichever one appears in the word, say it, point to it on the Northampton chart and repeat the sound in isolation.

Word list -	care	tear
	take	cake
	took	cook
	shot	shock
	till	kill
	late	lake
	call	tall
	cap	tap
	bat	back
	bite	bike
	might	Mike

- c. Words in sentences - Steve is to find the words with t and k and identify them following the same procedure as above. A multiple choice type exercise might be done with these sentences which would require Steve to read and monitor himself before making a choice.

Sentences -

Tom (cook) care of his new (bite).  
(took) (bike)

The doctor gave me a (shock) in the arm with a needle.  
(shot)

Bobby said he was (late) for speech.  
(lake)

John hit the baseball with a (bat).  
(back)

6. An additional activity to aid in the association between sound and symbol would be to have the children sort word cards into piles. These piles would be representative of each of the vowel sounds the children have worked on. The children could do this while the teacher worked with one child. As a check on what they did, the teacher would examine the piles having the child say the word on each card.

## LESSON C

## LESSON BACKGROUND:

The children seem comfortable in the routine of vowel identification that has been established. In order to set the sounds in their minds, they require frequent repetition done in various ways so they do not become bored. They have been exposed to sounds not specifically worked on in my teaching assignment period so there is a jumping off point for future work. Steve has been started in individual work for the confusion of t and k in words. It is aimed at improving his self-monitoring system.

## LESSON:

On the first day, there will be a review of all sounds already covered. This will be done through the use of sentence strips or the word cards made by the teacher.

Individual work has been tentatively worked out for Steve's t and k confusion. Use will be made of tape recordings of words sounding similar except for the t and k sound.

The overall approach is still to deliberately contrast sounds which are being confused or, in other terms, sounds not being monitored correctly. This will continue to place emphasis on associating the child's sound production and written forms of these sounds.

The lesson for this week will be a carryover from the last teaching period (see Lesson B). There will be additions of different vowels, ee and -e-.

## MATERIALS:

1. Tape recorder
2. Sentence strips
3. Word cards
4. Northampton charts

## PROCEDURE:

1. Review of vowels - ou, o-e, -i-, i-e, a-e, -a- and their secondary spellings. This will be done by presenting sentence strips which include words containing these sounds. The children will be asked to find these words and identify the vowels and point to the corresponding symbols on the vowel chart.
2. Contrasting -a- and a-e - See Lesson B.

3. Auditory training - See procedure in Lesson B.
4. Contrasting ee and -e- (See procedure for contrasting -a- and a-e.)

Word lists -

bed	bead
said	be
bell	reach
belt	beat
let	knee
better	tea
met	meat
red	meet
tent	sea
pen	clean
melt	need
head	seed
next	neat

Sentences -

Beth went home to eat supper.  
 Meat is good for you.  
 Steve met his friend, Ken, at the beach.  
 Ted's father painted their house light green.  
 Beth planted seeds in her backyard.  
 John let Ted put up the tent.  
 Everyone needs clean air and water to stay healthy.

5. An additional activity to aid in the association between sound and symbol would be to have the children sort word cards into piles. These piles would be representative of each of the vowel sounds the children have worked on and expose them to ones we have not dealt with yet. The children could do this while the teacher worked with one child. As a check on what they did, the teacher would examine the piles, having the child say the word written on each card and identify the vowel.
6. Individual work - Steve - See also procedure for last lesson.
  - a. To give Steve a kinesthetic feel for t and k, as well as auditory feedback, syllable drills using vowels already worked on will be done. These are written on railroad board ready to be presented.

ki-e	ki-e	ki-e	ti-e	ti-e	ti-e
ki	ki	ki	ti	ti	ti
ka-e	ka-e	ka-e	ta-e	ta-e	ta-e
ka	ka	ka	ta	ta	ta
ko-e	ko-e	ko-e	to-e	to-e	to-e
kou	kou	kou	tou	tou	tou
i-ek	i-ek	i-ek	i-et	i-et	i-et
ik	ik	ik	it	it	it
a-ek	a-ek	a-ek	a-et	a-et	a-et
ak	ak	ak	at	at	at
o-ek	o-ek	o-ek	o-et	o-et	o-et
ouk	ouk	ouk	out	out	out

- b. After Steve does the above drill, we will record his speech of each of these syllables. These will be in random order. A list of these syllables will be written out so that Steve can point to the syllable he hears. Upon hearing the syllable, he will first repeat what he hears, point to the syllable written on the board and then say it again.
- c. t and k will then be presented to Steve in the context of words. The list of similar sounding monosyllables will be written out for him to read first to make sure he is familiar with the pronunciation before these are presented to him from a tape recording with the voice of another speaker. He will be asked to point to the word he hears after each word is heard. The choices are as follows:

bike	kick	sick
bite	tick	sit
try	cool	bat
cry	tool	back
tall	tag	lake
call	cab	late
tail	wait	cap
coil	wake	tap
hike	shock	tight
night	shot	kite

Steve is to repeat the word he hears, point to the word and then repeat it again.

- d. Following this, Steve's speech for these words will be recorded and the same procedure as in c above will be followed.
- e. Word recognition - The above words will be embedded within sentences. The teacher will first have Steve read the sentence then she will say one or two words so that Steve cannot lipread. He will be asked to find these words in the sentence. (Optional - The task might be made a little more difficult by scattering the words composing the sentence on the board or listing them in random order so Steve does not merely memorize the position of the words in the sentence.)

Sentences -

Bill could not wait to go to the lake.  
 Don was late for school.  
 Tony tried not to cry when he got a shot.  
 Bobby held the kite string tightly.  
 When Tom was sick, he had to sit in bed.

- f. Further work with words in sentences - Steve is to pick the word that fits the sentence. This requires Steve to read and monitor himself before making a choice.



## Sentences -

Tom (cook) care of his new (bite).  
(took) (bike).

The doctor gave me a (shock) in the arm with a needle.  
(shot)

Bobby said he was (late) for speech.  
(lake)

John hit the baseball with a (bat).  
(back)

## LESSON D

## LESSON BACKGROUND:

The children have been exposed to all the vowel sounds through the use of the word cards used during the last teaching period. They are making a conscious effort to monitor their own speech and associate the sounds they produce with the written symbol. Lessons for these children is still aimed at contrasting vowels such as a-e and -a- and ee and -e- in terms of production and associating these with the written form.

## LESSON:

Review of the sounds already covered will be done. The children have been exposed to all the vowel sounds in the word card activity.

Individual work will be done with Steve on t and k as per the last teaching period. In addition, work will be done on the visual distinction between d, b, g, t and k which he seems to have trouble with.

Bobby needs more intensive work on self-monitoring. He still tends to rely on the written form of a word rather than by sound. E.g. He can say the word "ran" but points to the wrong vowel which happens to have a primary spelling -a.

The overall approach is to make a deliberate effort to contrast sounds which are being confused, or in other terms sounds not being monitored correctly. This will continue to place emphasis on associating the children's sound production and written forms of these sounds.

## MATERIALS:

1. Sentence strips
2. Word cards
3. Northampton charts
4. Tape recorder

## PROCEDURE:

1. Review of sounds already worked on - o-e, ou, i-e, -i-, a-e, -a- - through the use of sentence strips and word cards.
2. Contrasting ee and -e- - See procedure for last teaching period.
3. Contrasting <sup>1</sup>oo and <sup>2</sup>oo - See procedure for contrasting ee and -e-.

Word lists -	boot	book
	lose	took
	toot	cook
	school	look

tool	hook
cool	could
pool	should
shoe	would
do	wood
who	good
move	foot
food	pull

Sentences -

Connie took her boots to the shoe shop so they could be fixed.  
 The teacher said we should read our books in school so we would  
 not have homework to do at home.  
 It is getting cooler outside.  
 Who went on the boy scout hike?  
 Tom put some wood on the fire so he could cook some food.

4. Teacher prepared sentences will be written on the board. The teacher will cover her mouth and say a word or phrase. The child is to point to and say what he hears. The teacher might, instead, have the child write what he hears rather than just pointing to it in the sentence that is already written out. This will give practice in writing. The sentence may be covered so the child is forced to draw on what he received auditorily. Bobby needs specific practice doing this.
5. Individual work - Steve - See procedure from Lesson C.

## LESSON E

## LESSON BACKGROUND:

The children are secure enough in the vowel identification procedure that the teacher can divert from it without causing a reoccurrence of confusions the children were having in the beginning. There are still some instances when the teacher must revert to the old contrasting routine if a child does confuse the sounds. For the most part, the children are making conscious efforts to distinguish the sounds with little help from the teacher.

## LESSON:

Review of the sounds already covered will be done. This will be done using the word card game already described in previous lessons. The review will include consonants, b and d, t and k, f and t and g, as well as the vowels.

This week there will be a concentration on contrasting consonants which are, in the written form, particularly confusing to Steve. Syllable drills have already been done and will be continued into this week. These drills will then lead into words. The purpose of this will be to give the child a kinesthetic feel for the sounds as well as a visual orientation. Some memory game activities will be played in order to strengthen the association between the spoken and written forms.

Bobby will be given some individual work on improving his self-monitoring ability.

The overall approach is to make a deliberate effort to contrast sounds which are being confused, or in other terms, sounds not being monitored correctly. This will continue to place emphasis on associating the child's sound production and written forms of these sounds.

## MATERIALS:

1. Word cards
2. Vowel and consonant charts
3. Tape recorder

## PROCEDURE:

1. Review of sounds already worked on - o-e, ou, a-e, -a-, i-e, -i-, ee, -e- b, d, t, k - through the use of word cards.
2. Contrasting similar looking consonants - t, k, f, b, d, g, p.
  - a. Check to see if children can make each of these sounds correctly.
  - b. Teacher will say one of these sounds and ask the children to go to the charts and point to the sounds they hear. The teacher may use

the syllables in the cross drills already written on railroad board and have the child point to the consonant and the vowel. This will keep the vowel sounds in the picture so the children continue to have practice identifying them.

Sample of cross drills -

bi-e	bigh	by	di-e	digh	dy
bi	by	bi	di	dy	di
ba-a	bai	bay	da-e	dai	day
ba	ba	ba	da	da	da

There are also cross drills where the consonants are placed in the final position, where the same consonant appears initially and in the final position (da-ed) and where the two consonants appear in the same cross drill, e.g. ba-ed, da-ed, ba-eb. In these latter cross drills, the primary spelling only will be used to focus attention on the consonant differences and to reduce confusion.

- c. Teacher and children will think of words beginning with each of the consonants mentioned and list them (children will write and read these).

E.g.     k     t     f     etc.  
         kite   talk   foot

- d. Teacher will have the following sentences prepared. These sentences pairs or groups will be the same except for one word.

I see a fight.  
I see a kite.  
I see a bike.

Denise has a ball.  
Denise has a doll.  
Denise has a pal.

Mark carried a book.  
Mark carried a boot.

Cheryl had run to school.  
Cheryl had fun at school.

Silly sentences - (Nonsense syllables could be used also)

Kim sailed his pot in the pond.

boat  
dog  
goat  
coat  
toy

If nonsense syllables are used, they should preserve the phonemic environment except for the initial consonant, pat, bat, dat, gat, etc. Child will be asked to repeat what he hears and then write it. This is to check auditory reception and to give practice in writing.

3. Specific work on vowels - Similar looking words will be written by the teacher. and or by the child (words dictated to him). Child is to turn his back and listen to what the teacher says. After teacher says a word, child is to turn around and point to the word.

E.g.	run	meat	had
	ran	met	hid
	rain	mat	head
	traffe	said	read
	traffi	sad	red
	traffic	seed	raid

4. Memory game -

- a. Teacher will write single sounds on the board as follows -

t      f  
k      d  
b

g

The children will say each sound as teacher points to it to check for correct association between sound and symbol. Teacher will then have children close their eyes, she will erase one or more of the sounds, the children will open their eyes and are to tell and/or write what sounds were erased.

- b. Same procedure will be done with syllables -

ta-e      ga-e  
ka-e      ba-e

- c. Same procedure will be done with words -

tap  
cat      pat  
date      bat

5. Review discrimination for t and k with Steve. See procedure for Lesson C.

## LESSON F

## LESSON BACKGROUND:

The children are being weaned away from pointing out vowel sounds on the vowel chart. Only when an error is made does the teacher have the child go through the routine of vowel identification. Some of their vowel productions such as -i- and -e- are a little off target. When this occurs as they are saying a syllable they are asked to give the vowel in isolation and then find it on the chart to clarify it for themselves and for the teacher). If they point to the correct symbol but continue to produce the sound incorrectly, the teacher aids them by telling them the sound.

Similar looking consonants (written form) have been worked on in the form of memory games in which the letters are written on the board and one or more are erased. The children are to say and write the missing symbols. This seems to have been somewhat effective. Steve's ability to distinguish these is improving somewhat. The next step was to use the same consonants in combination with vowels in the same type of memory game. Words were then put in sentences which were worded alike except for one word, a word containing the consonants causing some difficulties in reading.

As a diversion type activity, Tell-Again-Story cards were used. The children read the story on the backs of the cards. This gave them practice in using the symbol-sound recognition skills that have been built up. They did fairly well on this task and needed minimal help in reading these stories. In addition, they enjoyed the activity and were anxious to read to discover the outcome of the story. Some of their sound-symbol confusions revealed themselves in this exercise but they were more well equipped to correct themselves.

## LESSON:

Review of sounds already covered will be done by using word cards and/or sentences prepared by the teacher. At this point, identification of vowels and consonants will be done in the same lesson. This is in an effort to make the identification skills more functional in terms of reading stories or short descriptive paragraphs.

There will continue to be some deliberate contrasting of similar looking symbols. This is primarily for Steve's sake. He still is on rather uncertain ground when it comes to this task. He tends to get auditory cues from the others when they respond before he does or while he is still attempting to figure out a sound or word.

Bobby will be given some individual work on improving his self-monitoring ability. When he is asked to think of a word containing a specific sound, he tends to think first of how the word is spelled, rather than the way it is said.

The approach now is an expansion of the deliberate, rather structured method of contrasting sounds and symbols. It is attempting to make the children's skills in sound-symbol identification more functional in terms of reading material.

from charts or simple books. There will still be a carryover of sound and symbol identification to reinforce what has already been learned and also to aid in correction of errors and improving word recognition skills.

#### MATERIALS:

1. Word cards
2. Northampton charts
3. Charts - stories
4. Tell-Again-Story cards
5. Selected easy readers.

#### PROCEDURE:

1. Review - Teacher will point to a symbol on the vowel or consonant chart and ask the children to say it to check for correct pronunciation and recognition. The teacher will have before the children the prepared word cards and/or Tell-Again-Story cards. The task will be for the children to find words (on the story cards or among the word cards) which contain the particular sound. The child will say the word and then the specific sound pointed to by the teacher.
2. If confusions between sounds reoccurs, consistently and frequently, the teacher will use the procedures already described in the last Lesson (E) - syllable drill, distinguishing between similar looking words such as tight and fight and then these words in sentences.
3. Auditory training - The above may be used for auditory training purposes with Steve and Bobby. Teacher hides lips and says the word. The child points to the word written on the board.

tight	lake	try
fight	late	Kim
light	take	Tim
fake	cry	kite
cake	dry	

See step 2d in Lesson E procedure. Teacher will also say phrases as well as words for the children to find.

4. Memory game - See step 4 in Lesson E for practice and reinforcement.
5. Specific work on vowels - Similar looking words will be written by the teacher and/ or by the child ( give child practice in writing from dictation). Teacher will hide her lips as she says a word. The child will then repeat what he hears and then point to one of the words written on the board.

E.g.	run	meat	hit
	ran	met	heat
	rain	mat	hat
		mit	



- 6. Steve - Review discrimination for t and k.
- 7. To aid in differentiating between the names for letters in the alphabet and the sounds represented on the vowel and consonant charts, we will go through the alphabet writing the Northampton pronunciation for the name of the letters.  
E.g.

<u>Name of letter</u>	<u>How we say it</u>
a	a-e
b	bee
c	see

Teacher will write the letters of the alphabet. Children will have to think of how they are said.

- 8. After this, the teacher will ask them to underline the vowel she points to on one of the Northampton charts. After one vowel at a time is marked off, such as a-e the teacher will list this on the side in a separate column to show them the names of letters are different from the way they are said. Since not all the vowels and consonants do not occur in this list, the teacher will ask or merely fill-in the missing sound symbols.
- 9. Reading practice using Tell-Again-Story-Cards and stories written by the teacher about various pictures - Functional use of skills being developed.

## LESSON G

### LESSON BACKGROUND:

We have gotten away from sounds and words in isolation. Sound and word identification have been incorporated into the reading of sentences and stories, the Tell-Again-Story cards. When the teacher points to a sound on one of the Northampton charts, the children are expected to look at a story card or a sentence and find a word which contains that sound. The routine of first saying the sound pointed to, finding the word, saying the word and then the vowel sound is followed. This is done as a review exercise and maintenance work. The children are retaining what they have been working on well. They can readily find words containing a particular sound.

The children are eager to read the Tell-Again-Story cards so this will be continued. The reading level of these stories seems to be just right, not too hard, but enough to make the children use their phonetic skills in a more functional way. Comprehension of the story is also checked to make the reading situation like that in the classroom.

The language master was introduced to the children this week. Work with this device will be gauged to Steve primarily although it can also be used as an aid in auditory training. We have only experimented with the language master thus far in order to determine whether it was adequate for the children - amplification, fidelity and practicality.

### LESSON:

Review of sounds through the use of Tell-Again-Story cards. The teacher will ask them to find words containing the sound she points to on the sound charts. Another means of reviewing and checking will be to ask the children to point to, on the vowel and consonant charts, the elements composing a word.

To promote functional use of phonetic skills, the teacher will use Tell-Again-Story cards. The children will read aloud and the teacher will write questions on the board for them to read and answer. Practice in phrasing will also be done using sentences from the story.

To aid in word attack skills some rather "analytic exercises will be given to the children. This will take the form of asking the children to mark syllables in a word, asking how many vowel or consonant sounds a word contains, writing the speech for words using the Northampton symbols and asking how many letters a word contains and how many sounds are in it. The reasons for these types of exercises are not meant to be in contradiction to the promotion of functional use of phonetic skills, sound symbol identification, etc. It has been noted during speech hour and in their classroom, that particularly Steve and Bobby make errors which seem to indicate that they are not looking at the elements of a word. This inattentiveness to the elements may indeed account in part for their difficulties in word recognition. They generally get through the first few sounds of a word but deteriorate when they get towards the end. It is as if they are trying to rush their way through the word. This hinders their ability to recognize words and thus the meanings.

Work will be done with Steve using the language master. This will be similar to the procedure used previously with him when the tape recorder was used.

The children will be given dittoed written exercises. These will be used to give the children practice in reading, writing, sounding out words, etc. independently. It is also extra work to occupy them while one child is being worked with.

**MATERIALS:**

1. Tell-Again-Story cards
2. Language master
3. Dittoes
4. Northampton charts

**PROCEDURE:**

1. Review - Teacher will point to a symbol on one of the Northampton charts. Child is to say the sound and then find a word on a Tell-Again-Story card which contains that sound. (The sentences appearing on each card will have been read out loud by all the children first before this is done to make sure their pronunciations are correct.) He will then read the word and say the sound that had been pointed to by the teacher.
2. Children will read aloud a Tell-Again-Story. Although emphasis will be on speech and correct pronunciation, the teacher will write running questions to check for story comprehension.  
E.g. Read the sentence, that tells you \_\_\_\_\_.  
What is the \_\_\_\_\_'s name?

The children are to give the answers orally first and then write them.

- Phrasing of words will be worked on using sentences from the story. This is to aid in increasing rate of reading, promote better understanding of relationship between word groups and make the children more fluent.
3. "Analytic " exercises -
    - Have the children mark off syllables in a word.
    - Ask children how many vowels and/or consonants there are in a word and what they are. In conjunction with this they may be asked to write, using Northampton primary spellings, the speech of the words.
    - Ask children how many letters a word contains and then how many sounds they hear in it. Children are to say and write the sounds using Northampton symbols or just point to them on the charts.
  4. See dittoed exercises
  5. Compare letters of the alphabet and how they are said. See Lesson F.

6. Steve - Language master -

- Teacher will first record syllables. Syllables will be written on the board. Steve will read these before he begins to listen to check for correct pronunciation.
- Teacher will play one syllable at a time, ask Steve what he heard and then have him find it on the list on the board.

Syllable list -

bo-e	bou
bee	bi-e
ba	bi
bah	bu
baw	bur
boi	be
boo	
ba-e	
boo	

- Steve will then record these same syllables and then perform the same identification task.
- Teacher will record words written on the board. Same identification procedure as above. Steve will then record the same words.

Word list -

boat	bake
beat	bike
bat	bill
bought	but
bomb	burn
boy	belt
boot	bait
book	back

- Sentences - Same procedure as above.

Pat ran in the rain.  
It rained on Thursday.  
It rained a lot last night.  
Rain is good for plants.

The sun is bright.  
Mr. Kay's son is bright.  
Some clouds covered the sun.

The doctor gave me a shot.  
Robert gave me a shock.

Mark flew a kite in the park.  
Mark turned on the light.

Take the cake to school.  
Eat the cake at school.  
Make the cake at school.

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

How many letters are there in each word?  
 THINK! Mark the syllables in each word, too.

	Number of letters	Write the word and mark the syllables
1. better	<u>6</u>	<u>better</u>
2. cold	_____	_____
3. pencil	_____	_____
4. Denise Emmich	_____	_____
5. paperclip	_____	_____
6. window	_____	_____
7. farmer	_____	_____
8. wanted	_____	_____
9. Robert Dreiman	_____	_____
10. dropped	_____	_____
11. classroom	_____	_____
12. Miss Kunimoto	_____	_____
13. butcher	_____	_____
14. Saturday	_____	_____
15. Stephen Pustka	_____	_____
16. traffic	_____	_____
17. looked	_____	_____
18. temperature	_____	_____

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Circle the vowel that does not sound the same.

- |     |        |        |        |
|-----|--------|--------|--------|
| 1.  | read   | seed   | head   |
| 2.  | care   | take   | paint  |
| 3.  | caught | laugh  | bought |
| 4.  | match  | ball   | back   |
| 5.  | eight  | light  | kite   |
| 6.  | ear    | pot    | saw    |
| 7.  | boast  | bought | low    |
| 8.  | said   | sail   | set    |
| 9.  | toy    | boil   | bowl   |
| 10. | keep   | kept   | let    |
| 11. | father | cat    | bother |
| 12. | pine   | been   | bit    |
| 13. | kind   | line   | lick   |
| 14. | tray   | try    | train  |
| 15. | boot   | took   | suit   |
| 16. | mark   | car    | bird   |
| 17. | fun    | lunch  | put    |
| 18. | hot    | cold   | note   |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Cross out the word that looks different.

- |           |       |       |       |
|-----------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. bed    | dcd   | bed   | bed   |
| 2. bid    | bib   | bib   | bib   |
| 3. face   | face  | race  | face  |
| 4. lake   | lake  | late  | lake  |
| 5. fall   | toll  | fall  | fall  |
| 6. put    | but   | put   | put   |
| 7. good   | good  | food  | good  |
| 8. feet   | keep  | feet  | feet  |
| 9. pipe   | pipe  | pipe  | pipe  |
| 10. dry   | dry   | pry   | dry   |
| 11. gray  | pray  | gray  | gray  |
| 12. quiet | quiet | quiet | quiet |
| 13. till  | fill  | fill  | fill  |
| 14. pay   | pay   | pay   | gay   |
| 15. Kim   | Tim   | Kim   | Kim   |
| 16. tape  | tape  | tage  | tape  |
| 17. gate  | gate  | gate  | ga ke |

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Read the words in the lists. Write the pairs  
 of words that rhyme (sound the same).  
 Then write the vowel.

A

Some  
 round  
 right  
 bake  
 bean  
 hook  
 cone  
 pull  
 school  
 bit

B

mit  
 make  
 sound  
 bone  
 kite  
 seen  
 look  
 tool  
 bull  
 come

ABVowel

1. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

5. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

6. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

9. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

10. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_



The following dittoed exercise was given to Steve and all the other members of his class. This was done just to see how well the others would do on the task of identifying the vowel that is not the same. Steve only had nine correct out of eighteen but he was not the lowest in the class. This task is admittedly difficult for the children but it is still felt that it might be a good exercise for focusing attention on vowel identification and for developing self-monitoring, auditory and kinesthetic, which the children need in order to self-correct.

## LESSON H

### LESSON BACKGROUND:

The children were given one of the dittoed exercises. "Circle the vowel that is not the same." They found this to be difficult so the past week was spent on this and some variations of the same exercise. The children's performance on this exercise indicated that the teacher should back up a step and work on vowel sounds alone (in context of same task - which vowel does not sound the same - trinary choice) or syllables. It was the teacher's feeling that the problem they encountered was a combination of not clearly understanding the task and still existing insecurity in self-monitoring and sound-symbol recognition and identification. Functional use of skills acquired up to this point was done through the use of Tell-Again-Story cards.

The language master - syllable presentation by teacher - was tried one day but did not seem to be an effective device to use for syllable presentation, at least. Words and sentences were not tried. Problems may have stemmed from poor fidelity and/or children's inexperience in listening to this type of auditory presentation. All three children had trouble in identifying the syllables played on the machine. The teacher abandoned the device and gave the syllables using live voice. Although they did identify a few more syllables correctly than they had been able to on the language master, they did not perform much better. Denise had the most difficult time so she was allowed to look and listen.

### LESSON AND PROCEDURE:

See plans for Lesson G.

TEACHING EVALUATION  
for  
February 1 - February 5

In general, the procedure of identification of vowels was followed consistently. The children are now in the routine of saying a word, underlining the vowel being worked on in the word, saying the vowel again, pointing to it on the vowel chart and then repeating the sound again. This was done in order to promote better ability to self-monitor. Bobby, for instance, would say "bowling" but would not, or could not monitor himself enough to recognize the difference between ow and o because of the identical secondary spellings. The problem of confusion between secondary spellings is still very prominent.

The children except for Denise can correctly say familiar words with certainty. Denise is very uncertain about the vowels and as a result encounters difficulty in sounding out a word. It was necessary for me to pick one sound, "ou", initially to give them a specific sound for which they were responsible. Whether they knew the other sounds or not, I wanted them to be able to monitor themselves sufficiently to at least distinguish this one sound from any others. In order to give them the idea that I wanted them to think about the vowel they said in a word, how it was written and that it was different from the other vowel sounds, I had to divert from my lesson plan and bring in some practice on contrasting o (ow) and ou (ow). The problem involved here was that the children were looking at the identical secondary spellings for these two vowels which just happen also to appear adjacent to each other on the vowel chart. I had to explain that these had the same spelling but were said differently. When I asked the children for some words containing the "ou" sound most all of them could except Bobby <sup>who</sup> gave the word "bowling". I had him write it on the board to see if he knew the spelling. The reason for his giving this word was because the words the others were writing on the board contained mainly the ow spelling. He spelled bowling correctly. This indicated to me that he was looking at the spelling rather than thinking of the vowel sound he was actually saying (oe). He repeated the word several times. When asked what the vowel was, he said ow despite the fact that within the context of the word he correctly said the oe sound. By the end of the week he showed a little better ability to isolate the vowel sound in a word, however, I still have to ask him to give me the vowel sound only. More often than not he says the whole word, he does not seem to be able to separate the one sound from the others although if he sees the sound written in isolation he can produce it. By the end of the week he showed a little better ability to discriminate but was still very uncertain. He would always look to me for approval. The other children for the most part eventually were able to distinguish between these sounds when they saw them in words, read them outloud, underlined the vowel and then pointed and said the vowel as it appeared on the vowel chart.

The progress of the two, Bobby and Denise, is slower than that of Karrie and Steve. Karrie has little difficulty. Steve is just gaining more confidence in himself. I try to give him as much positive reinforcement as possible without spoonfeeding him. The first time I asked him if he was sure about the vowel he had identified, he immediately went to change

his answer but when I explained I wasn't saying he was wrong, he hesitantly said he was sure he was right. I have noticed the most change in Steve as compared to the others. He is more willing to participate and can take correction without becoming upset as I know he does when he faces failure.

It was my feeling that the pace I set is too slow. There is a lack of adequate organization for these particular children. It is my feeling that they as well as myself require a more structured approach. This feeling may stem from the fact that I am still becoming acquainted with the children and their individual problems and also from the fact that I previously tutored a child using the association method; this child having a similar problem as this group. I find it difficult to explain things simply and clearly enough to avoid more confusion than is necessary.

Initially, I was too indulgent with the children and tried to be too kind. Now, however, they know that I expect them to use good speech and to attend to what is going on. Denise is the one I have the most difficulty with in regards to maintaining attention. I cannot tell whether it is my inability to draw her attention and/or that she doesn't really understand what is going on. More often than not I had to repeat directions for her.

I need to be or project more enthusiasm but with less talk on my part. This is improving with each session, though. My main concern is the slowness of my pace. If I were able to organize my thoughts more quickly on the spot, the pace would be quickened and we would get more accomplished in the amount of time we have. I am still searching for a way to make the children more aware of the task at hand and to make it easier for them.

TEACHING EVALUATION  
for  
February 8 - February 12

The same procedure has been followed for each introduction of new vowel sounds to be contrasted. This routine seems to be working effectively with the children. They are learning to focus on the particular sounds being worked on and have demonstrated that they are putting forth an effort to monitor their own production of the sounds to match the written form.

Steve is gaining more confidence in himself and does not become discouraged easily when he is wrong. When he does become frustrated it is usually my fault in that I present the material in a confusing way in my attempts to convey directions or give explanations. He is really exerting a concentrated effort to monitor himself. Steve with Karrie in the group now is the one who is excelling. This gives him opportunity to feel more success because Bobby and Denise are not quite up to his level of self-monitoring. *This success is good for Steve*

Bobby is exhibiting more effort to self-monitor. He repeats words to himself before trying to identify the vowels contained in them. Before this time, he did not do this. There is still the problem of his recalling spellings of words rather than the sounds that are composing them. This adds to his confusion between the names for letters of the alphabet and the sounds represented by the letters, e.g. a and a\_e. Bobby will give a long "a" sound for both. He is becoming a little more certain of himself and takes correction well. His participation is good and sometimes a little overdone. Impulsive answers are often the result. Bobby doesn't give himself time to think of what he is saying and how he is saying it, e.g. when working on i\_e and its secondary spellings, igh and y, Bobby offered the word "eight" (he recalled the spelling, said the word and did not monitor himself well enough to realize that the igh in the word was not the i\_e sound). Because he tends to be rather hyperactive, it is at times difficult for me to maintain his attention. As a result, I often find myself taking unnecessary time to settle him down. It might be better for me to ignore his behavior and attend to one child at a time. *Note suggestion in lesson plan.*

Denise is inattentive and difficult to motivate. She relies on Steve and Bobby to provide the answers because she knows I don't like to have to repeat directions to her over and over. I have not yet discovered a way to draw her into the lesson so that she willingly and consistently participates. Some form of reinforcement was suggested to alter her indifferent behavior. Despite this, she does appear to be less careless in identifying the vowel sounds she knows. If she gives the wrong sound for a particular vowel symbol she will try to self-correct when I ask her if she is sure about her answer. In comparison to Steve, she is not quite at the point where she can say with confidence "I am sure." Denise has shown herself to still have confusions on sounds we have worked on for a week. The confusions are not as "bizarre" as when we first began but they are still very evident. *Try techniques suggested in conference next time Denise is up*

In regards to my teaching, I feel that I am making progress with these *attentive* children. There is a good teacher-child relationship, that is, the children will take correction from me knowing that I am only trying to help them understand what the task is. There are times when I do not feel that I have them

under control and am contributing to their existing confusions. Each child has a slightly different problem, however, so I am trying to ignore the behavior of the others while I am working with one. At least this will be one of my main changes for next week. This will save time and give me more time to work with each child.

Thus far, I have not been giving each child individual attention during the period. As I noted through conversation and observations the problems they are encountering with particular sounds, I divert from my lesson plan, following the same general procedures and work on these, e.g. The confusion between i and e arose this week so I planned around this.

One of my main concerns at the moment is to find a way of getting through to Denise. Maintaining her interest has been a problem and is partly shown in her inattentiveness, lack of change in attitude and almost nonexistent participation. I try as often as possible to ask questions about herself, praise her for responding, anything to stimulate her to become as involved in the lesson as the two boys. I try not to leave her out even when she is not attending by asking her questions, repeating the directions, etc. In the meantime the two boys are waving their hands in the air wanting to give the answer. After having gotten Steve and Bobby up to an active participation level, I dislike not calling on them when I know they need the reinforcement.

*See first page - re conference*

*R.G.*

TEACHING EVALUATION  
for  
February 16 to February 19

It seems that the children are continuing to improve in their ability to monitor themselves, at least, they make the effort to do so by repeating words in an attempt to identify the vowel sounds. Since Denise has been seated between the two boys, she has been participating and attending better. It has also helped to give them visual rewards for good responses and participation. The only disciplinary measure I have taken is to erase points they get for their misbehavior. For the most part, they enjoy the competition. At times it is almost impossible to keep them from adding more words to a list we are compiling and at the same time concentrate on identifying the vowel sounds. Although this is distracting, I know they are still thinking. \*This kind of behavior is preferable to disruptive behavior. The work we do together is enjoyable and the children appear not to become bored or discouraged by it.

Whenever Bobby acts silly when he comes to the board, I make him go back to his seat and come back again. This usually is enough to settle him down for the time it takes him to go through the routine of identifying a vowel. He is becoming more consistent and certain of his responses although he still confuses "how you say it" and "how you spell it".

Denise needs to be pushed. She often makes what appears to be careless errors and will self-correct when her attention is drawn to her mistake. I have made it a point to ask her if she is sure about her answer as an indirect way of drawing her attention to what she is doing without really telling her she has made an error if she does make one. If she does not discover her error, I go back to the vowels in isolation and have her compare the word she is saying with the vowel sounds being worked on. Minimal auditory or visual cues are offered by me. Denise needs to rely on her own monitoring system to get through the task. If she cannot do it the other two boys are called on to help. As often as possible, I try to involve all the children except when individual attention is deemed necessary.

Steve is apparently challenged by sounding out words now. Verbal reinforcement is necessary to maintain the positive attitude he now has. Even when he has difficulty sounding out a simple word, his facial expressions don't indicate frustration or fear of being wrong, they are more like looks of concentration. This is due in part to my acceptance of any response he gives me. I do not believe I have ever said "No, that's wrong." or anything that directly negates what he has said. If I did, I think I would shake the confidence he has acquired up to now. In general, he gives good approximations to correct pronunciations of words. I just ask him to repeat what he said or to try again. Usually, he is able to work it out without much help from me. I feel that his present self-confidence stems mainly from the satisfaction he receives when he does this.

I feel that I am beginning to feel out the problems these children are experiencing. I have more confidence in myself because I have in mind what is wrong and a basic set routine for attacking it. Variations and modifications of this routine are innumerable so I feel free to try them as long as

\* Right!

the basic set remains because it seems to be working with the children. I am also encouraged by the improvement I see in the children, if not in their improved abilities then by their changing attitudes. My pace could be faster however.

I still need to construct an individual plan for handling Bobby's difficulty. At the moment, I am still unclear in my own mind about what Denise's primary problem is. They will need individual work also.

Ignoring silly behavior, usually Bobby's, has economized on time and I find that I can accomplish more in the time period. It is hard to turn Bobby off for any length of time so indifference appears to be the only solution at present. I may try to modify his behavior by rewarding the other children and not him when he is particularly bad. Despite his hyperactive behavior though, I feel he is working and getting something out of the lessons.

By having review lessons every week, I can tell whether the children still have these sounds straight in their minds. So far they seem to be retaining them. We have even tried identifying vowels we have not worked on, just as a change of pace and also to give me an idea of what confusions and errors they are making.

*Denise's inattentiveness &/or  
lack of interest maybe a cover-up  
for her sense of insecurity. Your  
suggested strategies should be  
beneficial*

*Excellent plans & notes.*

*R. Allen*



TEACHING EVALUATION  
for  
February 22 - February 26

In the demonstration given for Mrs. Scott, Steve was very subdued and displayed behavior very unlike that which is typical when we are in our regular setting for speech. He was easily frustrated when need for correction was implied by the teacher. He made confusions between b, d, f, g and t and k. These were not as apparent prior to this session. Ever since the demonstration, however, these confusions have become more noticeable. Steve is not sure at all about the distinction between these written symbols. He continues to show self-confidence in the task of identifying vowels in spoken and written form. He spontaneously says "I'm sure" when I ask him if he is positive his answer is right.

Robby is in need of specific work on "how you say it" and "how you spell it". He relies heavily on the written form and this confuses him in terms of the spoken and written forms. Up to this time, I have not been giving him individual help.

Denise has improved markedly in her attitude towards the tasks in speech. She is more enthusiastic and participates a great deal more than last week. I assigned seats so that Denise is in the middle. This seems to have helped a great deal in increasing Denise's attention. She is making a conscious effort to monitor herself. Careless errors were less evident this week. She seems to enjoy competition so I have been using a point system for correct responses. *Good*

The most impressive thing to me is that the children are treating me as their teacher. I feel that I can maintain their attention and interest without any major difficulty. During the past week, it did not seem as though I had to discipline any of the children by special means such as exclusion from the group or a verbal reprimand. All I needed to do was to stop talking momentarily, sit back in my chair and let them know I was waiting for them to settle down. I feel that we have an enjoyable relationship and that the children are continuing to gain confidence in themselves because I am accepting of them and do not criticize them for making errors even when the mistakes are ones they should not be making. So far they have been consistently correct in most instances where they must identify vowels we have worked on. There is a noticeable difference between identification ability for vowels we have worked on and those we have not contrasted formally in a lesson. *Perhaps this indicates that the*

*teaching strategies are helping eliminate some confusions*

*Re: Items - & consonant production -  
see me. (rather, I'll see you) R.H.*

## Teaching Evaluation- March 1-5

The children seem to be retaining what has already been worked on as indicated by the review sessions we had at the beginning of the week. They continue to make good, conscious efforts to self-monitor their own speech in identifying vowels and self-correct when they are in error.

This week I had no novel activities planned. I felt the children were becoming bored and so was I with the routine we have been following. It was my feeling that they were secure enough in the routine that we could break away from it for awhile without causing any recurrence of confusions. I continued to draw the children's attention to vowel sounds in written language just so they wouldn't think we were finished with them.

We did contrast ee and -e- and identified them within words and sentences. Bobby still experiences difficulty in how the sounds are said and how they are spelled. He says the words correctly but persists in going by spelling rather than by sound in regards to vowel discrimination. He must always be reminded to think and repeat a word over before he makes a decision about which vowel he is saying. He is getting better, however. Some sounds give him more trouble than others.

Steve has been exhibiting the k for t confusion again in his spontaneous speech as well as confusions between the letters b, d, p, g, t, k. I made up some syllable cross drills using the vowels we have worked on. First the drills were done with "b"

being the only one of the two I selected - b - d - presented in the initial and then the final positions. The same was done with "d". Then I wrote a cross drill in which these two occurred interspersed in the same drill. This was the same type of deliberate contrasting of two "problem" sounds. All the children responded well to this, particularly. We made it a game and they enjoyed having to be alert to what was written. Steve seemed to gain a certain amount of confidence in distinguishing b and d. Good enough!

Denise is doing well. She is paying attention more consistently than before. Her participation and enthusiasm is significantly better than it had been in the past. Denise is really working now, in my opinion, and makes fewer careless errors. I have not had to resort to disciplinary measures to make her attend.

So it that she has gained more confidence and so feels more secure & clear participate? Think we discussed her lack of assurance. RLS

## Teach Evaluation - March 8-12

An attempt is being made by me to move the children away from reliance on the sound charts for sound identification. I want them to be able to spot a sound within a word and give it back orally. We have begun reading Tell-Again-Stories and they seem to enjoy them because they are accompanied by attractive and interesting pictures and because the reading level is, I think slightly below or just at their level. Steve is doing fairly well although I do have to keep the reading rate slow so that the others do not shoo him out. Also, Steve is not reluctant or resistant to reading as long as he knows he is going to be able to keep up. As he reads, he appears to be looking at each sound rather than whole words. His word recognition ability is rather weak when familiar words are put into the context of a sentence or story. He does have to concentrate very hard on the written material before him, whereas the other two do not. I have noticed that even though the children can correctly produce sounds in isolation, they, especially Steve, have difficulty combining them. E.g. bandage (ban' dij) Steve had the word "bandaid" set in his mind that he could not for several tries say the syllable (dij), he kept saying (da-ej). Denise and Bobby did this also but they caught on faster than Steve.

The demonstration in Mrs. Scott's room last Friday went very well. Steve was much more relaxed and worked very well. In fact, he was telling his classmates when they were making errors and corrected them. Much of this change may be due to the fact that I let the whole class participate so the three did not feel they were being

77  
March 8-12

put on the spot.

When I introduced the Tell-Again-Story cards, Denise seemed to tune-out for some reason.

I could not determine exactly why because the two boys were very enthusiastic about reading the story about the "Cat and the Mouse" and wanting to continue reading. Denise appeared to be in a daze, just not attentive or with it. She did not fidget around but rather, stared at the cards and didn't read along with the others despite my urgings.

Steve still makes substitutions in his reading, e.g. b for p, but can self-correct when I merely point to the word again. He is not making random guesses as he did before.

I have not worked individually with Bobby yet to check on his auditory discrimination and association of spoken and written forms.

## Teaching Evaluation - March 8 to March 12

When asked to find a word containing a particular sound, the children show good ability to do so. The Tell-Again-Story Cards were used so that the children would have to read in order to find an appropriate word. All of the children did this easily. They are very certain of their answers now. I do not need to ask, "Are you sure?" very much anymore to build up their confidence. Robert is a little shaky, easily swayed if I give any indication that his response might be wrong.

When given new words such as "a typewriter", "language master", "tape recorder", they can recall fairly well from day to day. They can in some cases write the speech if they cannot remember the regular spelling. E.g. typewriter (tiepri-etur)

This week was a kind of rest week. Our activities were not as structured as usual. I let the children read from The Magic Riddle Book for fun and for practice in reading. They enjoyed looking at the book. Unfortunately the language and idioms were above them so I merely let them page through it while I worked with one child. The children were interested in the language master so we spent time working with it and seeing how it worked. Denise is even able to discriminate auditorily fairly well words and sentences played on the machine.

The children are eager to read another Tell-Again-Story. Difficulties they encounter in reading these stories do not particularly bother them. Steve is rather laborious in his reading. Denise and Robert are always finished before he is. Steve finds it necessary

Evaluation - March 8-12  
 for himself to try to say each element in  
 a word. Needless to say this significantly  
 reduces his reading rate and also, I believe,  
 hinders his comprehension of what he is reading.  
 That is, he tends to draw out a word so  
 that by the time he finishes reading it  
 he does not seem to recognize it as a  
 word he may know or have heard but  
 not seen in print. Robert on the other hand,  
 needs to be more attentive to the elements  
 in a word. He seems to be in too much of  
 a hurry to get through a word. As a result  
 he will only say part of a word unless he is  
 reminded to slow down and use good speech.  
 Denise is benefiting from the work being  
 given to the two boys. She continues to  
 be attentive and participates eagerly.

Your observations re Steve's  
 & Bobby's strategies go along  
 with their particular personalities  
 Steve - cautious, careful  
 Bobby - rush in head first

## Teaching Evaluation - March 22-26

In using the dittoed exercises, I found that the children needed much guidance in discerning the task. First I gave them an example of what was expected. They seemed to understand so I let them attempt the ditto individually under my guidance. They demonstrated more difficulty than I anticipated. E.g. Circle the vowel that does not sound the same.

bed head bead

Finally, I had to resort to using the exercise as a group lesson because it was obviously too difficult for them to do on their own. When asked, each child could read correctly the choice of words but could not readily pick out the dissimilar sounding vowel unless I went over the words with them, that is, having them read them aloud and then comparing two words at a time - E.g. bed head "Is the vowel the same or different?" "What is the vowel? Show me on the chart." Eventually they would circle the appropriate vowel sound. One factor that may have influenced this was that when working individually, they were not reading the words out loud which would have provided self-monitoring - auditory and kinesthetic. I didn't feel that their trouble with this lesson was due to lack of familiarity with the words used. Of the three, Steve required the most help.

3-29  
we've discussed this

When we read the Tell-Again-Story cards, Bobby and Denise are way ahead of Steve in terms of word recognition which can account for their faster reading rate. Denise reads the fastest and seems to comprehend a little quicker and better than the boys. I point to the words as they read out loud for the sake of phrasing and for Steve's sake because he is slow.



March 22-26

I try to listen to Steve more so than the others since he does have the most difficulty. He ~~repeatedly~~ fumbles with pronunciation of words in print even when the rate is slow. He doesn't seem discouraged, probably because he is concentrating so hard on reading the words that he doesn't really listen to or pay attention to the others who usually finish a line before Steve or I do. I feel Steve requires individual tutoring because I have not been able to give him enough of my time and make use of the lessons I prepare for him such as work with the language master. Although he has come along since I first began with him in terms of skills & attitude, I think I could have done much more for him if I had taken him alone in addition to the group speech hour because he does need to feel success in a group as well as personal success.

Need to be successful  
the individual behind most  
He's had the individual  
approach for several yrs

## FINAL TEACHING EVALUATION

### General Description of the Problems:

These children were evaluated as having particular difficulty in associating the spoken and written forms of the vowel sounds. This was supported by this teacher's observation and by information supplied by the supervising teacher and their classroom teacher. Prior to work with me, the children had done work on associating vowel sounds and their symbols. Speech books were kept of the work they had covered. Stress was placed on the children's learning to monitor, auditorily and kinesthetically, their own production of vowel sounds as they saw them written in isolation, then in words, phrases and finally in sentences.

The main stimulus was the written form of the vowel sounds in isolation, in words, in phrases and then in sentences. Work needed to be done on recognition of differences between primary and secondary spellings. It was noted by this teacher that the children frequently sought out spellings on the Northampton Chart rather than going by the sounds the symbols represented.

E.g. If the words bowl and clown were presented in written form, the children would point to either ow or ow for the vowel in either word. They attempted to find the easy way out by searching for similar looking symbols.

Though these children have had much work on this association between the written form and their own monitoring of the spoken form, these children continue to require reinforcement type practice. Minimal auditory cues were given by the teacher since Steve and Bobby have considerable hearing and need the practice in auditorily monitoring their own speech.

Another thing that had to be watched was the consistent manner of writing letters, drawing lines from left to right, etc. Steve and Bobby especially were held responsible for correct writing habits. This was done for the purpose of enhancing the establishment of the written patterns of the sound symbols.

*left to right movement →  
up to down ↓*

### Description and Evaluation of Teaching Procedure:

Early in the period of teaching, a set routine of vowel identification was established so that the children would have a way of citing specific vowels to be worked on. This routine seemed to help the children focus on the sounds. They knew the routine of finding the vowel - say, for instance, a word containing a vowel, underline the vowel(s) being worked on, say the vowel, point to the corresponding symbol on the vowel chart and repeat the sound. This also facilitated the lesson. The children knew what to do without my having to tell them.

The overall approach that eventually evolved from working with the children and noting their specific difficulties was to deliberately contrast sounds which were being confused or, in other terms, sounds not being self-monitored correctly. This continued to place emphasis on associating the children's sound production and written forms of these sounds. This was also meant to be a different way of getting at vowel identification.

In general, vowels were introduced in pairs such as ou and o\_e. These pairs were contrasted on the basis of "how we say it" and "how we spell it". because the children tended to confuse the similar secondary spellings, ow and ow for instance. This manner of dealing with the vowels seemed to be effective. The children became more certain and consistent in the identification of vowel symbols and sounds. ✓

An integral part of this overall approach was to build up the children's self-confidence. In the beginning, Steve was fearful of making errors, Denise was inattentive and Bobby made rather random guesses at vowels. Part of this, I felt, was due to lack of self-confidence. During the early weeks of the teaching period, I had to give much verbal, positive reinforcement. When the children made a mistake, I avoided saying "that's wrong" but then I felt I conveyed the feeling that I was accepting ~~of~~ their errors. This was particularly the case with Steve. He was timid, hesitant to respond, volunteered few answers and did not like to be wrong. When he realized that I was not disappointed in him when he made a mistake, he opened up more in terms of spontaneous speech. After a couple of weeks, I began to make the children less reliant on me for telling them whether they were right or wrong. My usual remark after their response would be "Are you sure?" whether they were correct or not. The other members of the group were asked to help evaluate in order to keep them involved in the activity. When this was first done, the children would immediately assume they were wrong and change their answers so I explained that I was not saying they were wrong. I wanted them to get into the habit of checking on themselves rather than guessing. This proved to be an effective device in making the children more sure of themselves, more responsive, in general, and also seemed to help in vowel identification (because they had to think before they answered, correct themselves when necessary and help in evaluating each other's responses).

By the end of the teaching period I felt that I had covered the vowels fairly thoroughly by way of contrasting two at a time. Each weekly review session indicated to me that the children were retaining what they had learned before and were gaining confidence in the tasks presented to them. I could not tell whether this work was being carried over much into their classroom work, however. *Yes, it was!*

I was satisfied with the progress of the children in terms of ability to identify vowels (sound-symbol association), adaptation to the routine set up for this identifi-

84

cation, ability to self-monitor and self-correct, improvement in attitude and attentiveness, and increased confidence. These are likely not all results of the particular methods used by this teacher although I feel my relationship with the children enhanced their learning. They put forth considerable effort when asked to do a task. They were aware of what I expected of them - good speech, thinking on their part, attentiveness - and as a result performed well most of the time.

*Your attitude & consistent procedures did help!!*

#### Individual Evaluation of the Children:

Denise was initially inattentive and unresponsive, perhaps due to lack of understanding of the task. She would guess at the vowels and was not consistent in identification of these. The teacher had to make a concerted effort to draw her attention to what was being done and maintain it. After she became accustomed to the routine, she seemed to change and actively participated in the lessons. She enjoyed competing with Steve and Bobby when rewards (marks on the board) were given for correct responses. In comparison to the two boys, she got off to a slower start but soon caught up when she became more active in the group. Some of the errors she makes are still careless ones while others are still true confusions. These confusions are generally relationship to secondary spellings. This was common to all the children at the end of the teaching period.

Bobby's main problem seemed to be the confusion between how a word is spelled and how it is said. He became better able to identify the vowels in isolation and in words in printed form. When asked to say a word containing a certain vowel such as "ou," he would still tend to go by spelling rather than by sound. He would confuse similar secondary spellings. He does not seem to fully realize the relationship between secondary spellings and their primary spelling. By the end of the teaching period, he did make fewer errors, however, the problem still exists.

Steve greatly improved in his attitude towards facing written material. This has already been discussed so I will not go into it further. Although he improved in vowel identification and worked on the identification of consonants as well, he continues to have difficulty in the task of reading. He was the slowest reader of the three. It was good to see that he did not become frustrated when they did choral reading of tell-again-story cards since he was always the last to finish. I tried to keep it at his rate of reading so that he would not feel discouraged. He made an obvious effort to read every word. His concentration appeared to be so great at times that he seemed to be unaware of the others reading aloud which I thought might bother him since he has considerable hearing. He was never discouraged when the others finished before him. When he mispronounced words, I would just point to the word again without saying anything so that he would sound it out for himself. Steve's problem is certainly not confined to association between sound and symbol. He has

difficulty recognizing a whole word once he has sounded it out. The meaning of the word is not always quickly associated with the printed form of the word. Word recognition skills need to be further developed.

Excellent evaluation  
a ~~fine~~ great teaching job!  
R.Y.

He does seem to have the basic sentence structure fairly straight - subject, verb, object. He has a good vocabulary repertoire and can use it. His reception and comprehension of oral language seems good. This is based on his ability to respond appropriately when asked a question for instance.

Steve's comprehension of written language is not on the same level as his oral abilities. It still takes him a long time to sound out a word. Once he sounds out the word, he does not necessarily know what it means even if it is a familiar word which he knows and uses spontaneously in spoken language. He would recognize it if someone said it to him. His spontaneous written language seems to be on about the same level as his spontaneous spoken language.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the idea that any impairment in the reception of language interferes with development of linguistic competence, Steve's problems at this time can, in general, be attributed to his hearing impairment. He does or did, however, exhibit some language behavior that is not always typical of hearing impaired children. The particular behavior eluded to here is that of slowness in ability to associate meaning with the written form of familiar words especially when it is read outloud by Steve. Possibly, in this specific task, reading outloud and the self-monitoring involved, auditory and kinesthetic, may be important factors in analyzing Steve's linguistic performance and competence. No test was given which compared how well Steve comprehends written language when he reads silently and when he reads outloud. The Token Test and the results of the reading tests imply that Steve has less difficulty comprehension-wise when he reads silently.

Steve has demonstrated much improvement in attitude and use of capacity for language. The discrepancy between apparent capacity for language use and actual level of language functioning does not seem as outstanding now as it did earlier in the year.

Steve should be kept in a group and receive semi-structured teaching since he seems to operate well in this type of situation. Rationale for keeping him in a group is to allow him to experience success in the presence of his peers. Through this he can be given the opportunity to succeed and gain more self-confidence, become more accepting of correction and be more willing to attack new material because he has the skills to do so. He should also be given extra help in areas where he is weak so that he gets a better foundation from which to work. Steve needs much encouragement and reassurance that he is capable of doing just as well as the other children.

#### REFERENCES

1. Bateman, Barbara, "Learning Disabilities - Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," Exceptional Children, December, 1964.
2. Kleffner, Frank R., "Children's Language Disorders: Redefinition and Reinterpretation," Proceedings of the International Conference, vol. 2, 1967.